



LOCKWOOD
ADVISORY

WORKING ANALYSIS · LANDGATE · LOCKWOOD ADVISORY · MMXXVI

Spatial WA Use Case Review

Documentation review and strategic analysis

Internal working document for Nicole Lockwood. Pattern-rich, not client-facing. The substrate the Strategic Review Report will be built upon once the interview findings come in.

PREPARED FOR

Nicole Lockwood · Lockwood Advisory

ENGAGEMENT

Spatial WA · Executive Advisory Services for Landgate

PREPARED BY

The Legacy Impact Studio · Perth, Western Australia

DATE

18 May 2026

Contents

Thirteen sections of integrated analysis. Built from the Business Case, the Project Definition Plan, the signed Participation Agreements, the Use Case Scope Definition V1.4, and the current technology contracts.

- § 01 The frame.....
- § 02 What the Program is now actually building.....
- § 03 From the Business Case's ten use cases to the PDP's four.....
- § 04 Where the benefits case is strong, wobbly, recalibrating.....
- § 05 Strategic alignment, then and now.....
- § 06 The IP&A use case: the heart of the engagement.....
- § 07 Governance and signed commitments.....
- § 08 The post-MoG landscape, and what is still unclear.....
- § 09 Timing and the 2028 deadline.....
- § 10 Working hypotheses for Nicole's interview round.....
- § 11 Nicole's positioning in the work.....
- § 12 Headline framing for the Strategic Review Report.....
- § 13 Potentials log.....

§ 01

The frame

Landgate's RFQ asks for a strategic review of one specific component of the Spatial WA Program: the use case that carries the largest concentration of the Program's expected benefits. The integrated documentation now lets us name it precisely. The use case is Use Case 3, formally titled Infrastructure Projects and Assets (IP&A), led by the Public Transport Authority on behalf of the post-MoG Department of Transport and Major Infrastructure.

The anticipated benefits profile associated with the Program predominantly sit with the Infrastructure Planning and Assets use case.

The RFQ's phrasing ('Infrastructure Planning and Assets') is slightly different from the Program's formal naming ('Infrastructure Projects and Assets'), but they refer to the same use case. The Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 (October 2025) is the live operational specification.

What Nicole has committed to in Stage 1 (proposal, p4):

1. Documentation review and strategic analysis (approximately 2 days).
2. Stakeholder consultations (10 x 1hr, Chatham House conventions).
3. Synthesis, recommendations and reporting (approximately 2 days).

Deliverable: a 15 to 20 page Strategic Review Report to the Program Director and Program Board, due 30 June 2026. This working document is the substrate the Strategic Review Report will be built upon, once the stakeholder interview findings come in.

This is version 2 of the working analysis. Version 1 was written from the Business Case and Cost Benefit Analysis alone. Version 2 integrates the Project Definition Plan, its critical appendices (Strategic Alignment, Use Case Scope Development, Implementation Plan, Agency Participation Agreements, Benefits Management

Plan), the live Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 dated October 2025, the Implementation Kickoff Working Group materials from February 2026, and the current Advisory Onboard deck. Several of v1's open hypotheses are now answered; others remain and have sharpened.

§ 02

What the Program is now actually building

The Business Case described ten quantified use cases and three qualitative ones. The Project Definition Plan, signed and approved in January 2024, consolidated the ten quantified use cases into four priority use cases for Horizon One, plus added one net-new theme (emergency management exposure modelling).

The current operational scope, as of the Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 (October 2025), is:

#	USE CASE	LEAD AGENCY	ORIGIN IN THE BC
UC1 (Obj 1)	Administrative Boundaries for 4D Land Management (AB4D)	Landgate	Absorbed BC use cases 3.1 (DBCA), 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4 (Landgate)
UC1 (Obj 2)	Unlocking Land Potential for Investment (ULPI)	Landgate	Absorbed BC use case 9.1 (DPIRD)
UC2	Digital Approval Workflows (DAW)	DPLH	Absorbed BC use case 2.1 (City of Swan/LGs). Was flagged in the BC as 'not yet aligned' to Planning Reform; the alignment has now happened
UC3	Infrastructure Projects & Assets (IP&A)	PTA (for DTMI)	Absorbed BC use cases 16.1 (OMTID, \$204.6m), 17.1, 17.2 (PTA, \$49.9m), and likely 5.1,

#	USE CASE	LEAD AGENCY	ORIGIN IN THE BC
			5.2 (DoT). Approximately \$254m of the BC's \$394m quantified benefits sit inside this use case.
UC4	Exposure Modelling for Emergency Management (EMEM)	DFES	Net new. Not in the BC's ten quantified use cases

This consolidation is the single most important shift between the Business Case and the current Program. The BC's benefits structure was built bottom-up from agency-specific use cases. The PDP rolled them into themes that can be delivered cross-agency, with named lead agencies accountable for each theme.

Technology contracts were awarded in October 2025:

- **NGSC Provider: Accenture.** The Next Generation Spatial Cadastre platform. Hosting on AWS.
- **SDT Provider: Jacobs.** The Spatial Digital Twin platform. Hosting on Azure. Subcontractors: GC3 Digital (digital twin SME), Amristar (solution enablement), Terria (visualisation/UX), Surround Australia (3D CSM).

Both contracts commenced 27 October 2025, with a seven-year initial term and Landgate options to extend by 5 + 3 years. Implementation runs to mid-2028 across staged releases. As of February 2026, the Program is at the Working Group kickoff stage for implementation, having just onboarded the technology partners.

§ 03

From the Business Case's ten use cases
to the PDP's four

The Benefits Management Plan (PDP Appendix M) is explicit about what happened to the BC's quantified benefits:

Three of the four represent an amalgamation of the ten example use cases in the Business Case, together with one additional use case theme relating to emergency management... The economic benefits attributable to the ten use cases in the CBA have been reviewed in line with the detailed scope to confirm the benefits remain valid. As the Business Case parameters have not materially changed, no further analysis has been undertaken on the expected measurable benefits.

In other words: the PDP took the BC's \$394m use case PV and \$1.1bn WEB PV at face value, reorganised them under four themes, and committed to recalibrate later via the Benefits Management Plan. Specifically, methodology step 4 in the BMP is to 'Validate the estimated benefits from the CBA (and recalibrate if necessary)'. Recalibration is in scope. It has not yet happened.

This matters for two reasons:

4. The headline economic case (BCR 14.4, NPV \$1.4bn) was carried forward from the BC into the PDP unchanged. The PDP did not subject it to fresh analysis.
5. Several BC line items have lost a clearly identified owner in the consolidation. Most notably, Use Case 20.1 (Buried Services, Water Corporation, \$48.5m) was the third largest line in the CBA. Water Corp is not a signatory to any of the five signed Participation Agreements. Their role in the new structure is as a stakeholder in IP&A and as a utility data provider, not as a use case lead.

Where the BC's benefits sit in the PDP four

BC USE CASE	PV (\$M)	NOW SITS WITHIN
16.1 Minimise utilities impact on transport projects (OMTID)	204.6	IP&A (UC3). Water Corp now framed as a stakeholder, not co-lead
9.1 Locating future land/water development (DPIRD)	54.6	UC1 Obj 2 - ULPI (Landgate-led)
20.1 Buried services (Water Corporation)	48.5	IP&A (UC3) as utility data theme. No Water Corp Participation Agreement
17.1 Built infrastructure and assets lifecycle assurance (PTA)	40.4	IP&A (UC3) - PTA-led
2.1 Development & Building application processes (City of Swan)	25.5	DAW (UC2) - DPLH-led
17.2 Geospatial engineered BIMs (PTA)	9.5	IP&A (UC3)
14.2 Urban Forest visualisation (Landgate + LGs)	3.8	AB4D (UC1 Obj 1) data theme
14.3 Spatial GPR (Landgate + RIA)	3.5	AB4D (UC1 Obj 1) data theme
3.1 4D Land ownership boundaries (DBCA)	3.0	AB4D (UC1 Obj 1) - DBCA signed as support agency
14.1 Reduce effort to adjust spatial cadastre (Landgate)	0.6	AB4D (UC1 Obj 1) - Landgate internal
	394.0	

The structural picture: of the BC's \$394m use case PV, approximately \$254m (64.6%) is now bundled inside IP&A (UC3, PTA-led). Approximately \$80m sits inside the Landgate-led use cases. \$48.5m (Water Corp's old Buried Services line) is in IP&A's stakeholder pool but has no formal Participation Agreement underneath it. \$25.5m (Local Government processing benefits) is inside DAW (UC2, DPLH-led).

§ 04

Where the benefits case is strong, wobbly, recalibrating

With the PDP consolidation now visible, the v1 stress-test holds up but the locations of strength and weakness are clearer.

Where the benefits case is strongest

- **AB4D (Use Case 1 Obj 1, Landgate-led).** This is the most operationally secure of the four use cases. Landgate is both lead agency and accountable Program owner. DBCA (Stuart Smith, DG) and DMIRS (Richard Sellers, DG, now DMPE post-MoG renaming) both signed Participation Agreements in August 2023. The cadastral data work is well-defined, with a real, world-class dataset to be modernised. The economic exposure is modest (\$3-10m range from the BC's \$14 series) but the foundational value is high. The release schedule shows AB4D capability coming live in NGSC Release 1 in mid-2026, before the other use cases.
- **DAW (Use Case 2, DPLH-led).** Anthony Kannis signed the Participation Agreement for DPLH on 25 August 2023. The Action Plan for Planning Reform now provides explicit strategic cover. The BC's \$25.5m benefit estimate (which v1 flagged as methodologically aggressive due to the 17x population multiplier) is now backed by DPLH's commitment to lead the use case, and the agency-level engagement model has been formalised. The methodology risk persists but the sponsorship risk has been eliminated.

Where the benefits case is wobbly

- **IP&A (Use Case 3, PTA-led for DTMI).** The use case that carries the largest concentration of the BC's benefits (\$254m or 64.6% of UC-quantified PV). The Participation Agreement was signed in August 2023 by Russell Taylor,

PTA Chief Information Officer, NOT by Peter Woronzow (the BC's listed 'DG Transport Portfolio' partner). The signed commitment therefore sits at CIO level inside PTA, with the political/portfolio cover coming from the broader Transport portfolio relationship. The recent MoG changes formed the Department of Transport & Major Infrastructure (DTMI), which now houses PTA, the renamed Main Roads, OMTID, and the new Office of Major Infrastructure Delivery (OMID). PTA is leading IP&A 'for DTMI' per the current onboarding deck. Whether the CIO-level commitment carries through the MoG reorganisation is the most consequential single question for Phase 1.

- **Water Corporation's \$48.5m.** Water Corp is named in the BC as one of three committed partners (alongside DBCA and PTA), with \$48.5m of benefits in the CBA's third-largest line (Use Case 20.1 Buried Services). In the PDP structure, Water Corp appears as an IP&A stakeholder and an operational readiness 'Level 1 Guided Partnership' agency, but does NOT have a signed Participation Agreement. The Buried Services benefit mechanism is preserved in scope (IP&A's initial focus is 'water utilities'), but the formal organisational commitment Water Corp made at the BC stage has not been re-formalised at the PDP stage. Worth probing carefully.
- **The vacated Use Case Lead role.** The RFQ states the Use Case Lead departed in February 2026, with 'limited traction with the use case since'. In the Program team structure, the Use Case Project Lead is a PSCA Level 8 position funded by Landgate but placed within PTA, working in partnership with a Data Analyst (Level 6). Both roles are inside PTA. The vacancy is therefore not a Landgate vacancy; it is an agency-embedded role that lost its incumbent at PTA during the post-MoG period. Restoring it requires both PTA's HR cycle and the operational readiness work to re-anchor.

Where the BC's headline economics will likely soften

The BMP says the recalibration of the CBA benefits has not been done yet. When it is, three lines are exposed:

- The 17x population multiplier for City of Swan (now inside DAW). Unchanged methodology, unchanged risk.
- OMTID's \$204.6m utilities-impact line, modelled by Rider Levett Bucknall on OMTID's behalf with high-low sensitivity of \$114m. Whether OMTID's post-MoG successor inherits this benefit, or whether OMID picks it up, will determine where the line lives. The Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 names both OMTID and OMID as stakeholders, suggesting both still exist.
- WATC's footnote on the WEBs (page 17 of the CBA): 'strictly speaking these would be more accurately described as Economic Benefits in a general sense, instead of WEBs which has a specific meaning under the ATAP guidelines'. The \$1.1bn WEB layer was not freshly analysed for the PDP. It remains presentation-grade, not benefits-realisation-grade.

The Strategic Review Report can quietly anchor recommendations in the use-case BCR of 3.8 (which is robust) rather than the headline 14.4 (which is not), and recommend that the BMP recalibration be brought forward.

§ 05

Strategic alignment, then and now

PDP Appendix A (Strategic Alignment) reaffirms the BC's strategic anchors with two small but consequential updates:

6. **Action Plan for Planning Reform is now formally listed.** In the BC, Planning Reform was flagged as 'not yet aligned' because the timing of Planning Reform and the BC's development did not coincide. The PDP names it as a strategic alignment, fed by the DPLH-led DAW use case. This was a successful follow-through, and it gives DAW strategic cover it did not previously enjoy.
7. **State Infrastructure Strategy Recommendation 4b** is reaffirmed with the same language: Office of Digital Government and Landgate as joint leads.

The 2024 target completion in the original recommendation has been missed (by definition, given the actual contract start was October 2025), but Spatial WA remains the named delivery vehicle. Whether the second SIS treats this as a recovery path or as a deprioritised item is information Nicole has direct access to from her IWA chair tenure.

The other anchors continue: Digital Strategy 2021-25 (sunsetting this year), Streamline WA, Interoperability Policy, Open Data Policy, plus the Cloud Policy (newly added in the PDP) and compliance policies (Digital Services, ICT Disaster Recovery, Cyber Security, Information Classification).

Per the Advisory Onboard deck, the Program is positioned against four of the six current Government strategic priorities to 2029: Diversifying the economy, Housing, Safe & Inclusive communities, Infrastructure Services. (Not Healthcare or The Environment.)

What has shifted underneath

- **Transport Portfolio MoG.** The current Working Group composition explicitly includes both 'Department of Transport & Major Infrastructure' (DTMI, the post-MoG entity) and 'Office of Major Infrastructure Delivery' (OMID, the new infrastructure delivery office that sits broader than transport). OMTID still exists as a separate entity. The MoG documentation itself is not in our document set; the new structure is inferable from the WG membership.
- **DMIRS to DMPE.** The Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety has been renamed to Department of Mining, Petroleum and Energy (DMPE) per the post-MoG WG listings. The Participation Agreement was signed by Richard Sellers as DG of DMIRS in August 2023; whether Sellers carried into the DMPE role is worth confirming.
- **Digital Strategy 2021-25 is sunsetting.** A 2026-30 successor is presumably in development; the documents do not name it. Spatial WA's standing in any successor strategy is a Stage 2 conversation rather than a Stage 1 finding, but is worth raising in the interview round.

§ 06

The IP&A use case: the heart of the engagement

The Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 (October 2025) is the live spec for Infrastructure Projects & Assets. The intent and structure are now well-defined, with a chosen demonstration site, an initial utility focus, and a documented release plan.

Scope at a glance

- **Objectives:** support delivery of major infrastructure projects (asset planning, delivery, relocation, ongoing management); support wider precinct planning and management for the area surrounding the infrastructure project.
- **Demonstration site:** the Midland Train Station Precinct. This is where the use case will be operationally validated.
- **Initial focus:** water utilities, due to Water Corporation's involvement. Other utilities (power, telecommunications) are in scope but secondary.
- **Main focus:** the planning phase of infrastructure lifecycle. Build and maintenance phases are addressed at a lower depth.
- **Releases:** four planned epics — Release 1 (MVP / basic visualisation), Release 2 (Collaboration & Workflows), Release 3 (Advanced Analysis), Release 4 (Added Value). UAT for each across 2026-28.

Stakeholder ecosystem (per the Use Case Scope Definition V1.4)

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	MEMBERS
State Government — major transport infrastructure	Public Transport Authority (lead), Department of Transport & Major Infrastructure, Main Roads WA, Office of Major Transport Infrastructure Delivery, Westport, Infrastructure WA, Office of Major Infrastructure Delivery

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	MEMBERS
State & Local Government — surrounding precincts	City of Swan, Development WA
Utility Service Providers	Water Corporation, Western Power
Infrastructure Delivery Consortiums	Midland Junction Alliance

Two things to note here. First, Westport appears as a stakeholder. Nicole is Chair of Westport. This is a material disclosure beyond the IWA chair tenure already declared in the proposal's conflict of interest statement. The COI declaration should be extended to cover Westport, with the same management controls applied. Second, OMTID and OMID both appear as separate stakeholders, suggesting both entities exist post-MoG with related but distinct mandates. OMID is likely the broader new infrastructure delivery office; OMTID continues as the transport-specific one.

The vacated lead role, in operational terms

The IP&A Use Case Lead operational role is a PSCA Level 8 position, funded by Landgate but embedded within PTA, paired with a Level 6 Data Analyst. The role was created under the August 2023 Participation Agreement and is the operational interface between PTA, the Program Team, and the wider stakeholder ecosystem. Its responsibilities, per the signed agreement:

- Champion and lead business-to-business engagement for use case development and implementation.
- Coordinate and lead working group discussions to capture stakeholder outcomes.
- Engage with PTA and stakeholders on data improvement, technology, processes, and SDT capability.
- Coordinate across Program workstreams.
- Maintain a strong working relationship with the Program Team.

That role being vacant for five months, in the same period as the Transport Portfolio MoG settled, explains the 'limited traction' the RFQ describes. Reinstating it is necessary but not sufficient. The new incumbent needs both technical capability and credible standing with the wider DTMI stakeholder ecosystem, which is precisely the gap Nicole's Stage 2 advisory role is designed to fill while the operational role is being re-staffed.

§ 07

Governance and signed commitments

The PDP's Appendix J contains five signed Participation Agreements. These are the formal organisational commitments to the four PDP use cases:

USE CASE	LEAD/SUPPORT AGENCY	SIGNATORY	ROLE	DATE SIGNED
IP&A (UC3)	PTA (lead)	Russell Taylor	Chief Information Officer	7 Aug 2023
DAW (UC2)	DPLH (lead)	Anthony Kannis	Director General	25 Aug 2023
AB4D (UC1 Obj 1)	DMIRS / DMPE (support)	Richard Sellers	Director General	17 Aug 2023
AB4D (UC1 Obj 1)	DBCA (support)	Stuart Smith	Director General	Sep 2023
EMEM (UC4)	DFES (lead)	Darren Klemm	Commissioner	30 Aug 2023

Three things stand out from these signed commitments:

- **PTA's commitment is at CIO level, not DG level.** This shifts how the executive sponsorship question should be framed. In the BC, Peter Woronzow appeared as 'DG Transport Portfolio' alongside the partner agency listing. In the signed PDP Participation Agreement, the signing

officer is the PTA CIO. The CIO-level commitment is operationally robust but the DG-level political cover sits elsewhere, presumably with whoever now holds Woronzow's old role (and whether Woronzow is still in that role post-MoG is open).

- **Anthony Kannis personally signed for DPLH.** The DG-level commitment on DAW is firm. This is the strongest sponsorship signal in the entire agreement set.
- **Water Corporation is absent.** Despite being named as one of three 'committed partners' in the BC (alongside DBCA and PTA), Water Corp has no signed Participation Agreement. This is the most consequential gap in the signed commitment structure.

The Spatial WA Program Board

Per the Advisory Onboard deck, the Program Board's named agency sponsors are: Landgate, PTA, DPLH, DFES, Infrastructure WA, Treasury, and the Office of Digital Government. Seven agencies. The Board operates under the Landgate Board (which reports to the Minister for Lands). It interacts with two external committees: MPERSC (Major Projects Expenditure Review Sub-Committee) and the Office of Digital Government's contract management governance. It also reports to WALIS Council and DALAC.

This is a more developed governance structure than the BC described, with explicit MPERSC oversight that wasn't named in the BC.

The Program team

Named roles in the current Program team (per the Advisory Onboard deck):

- Spatial WA Program Director (named role, occupied).
- Spatial WA Program Manager.
- PMO Lead.
- Use Case Project Leads and Data Analysts for each use case (UC3 IP&A is the vacant one).

- Principal Consultant for SDT (Jacobs).
- Principal Consultant for NGSC (Accenture).
- Principal Consultant for Data Governance (Enabling Project 7).
- Delivery Partner Lead.
- Change Lead.
- Benefits Manager.
- Operational Readiness Manager.
- Communications & Engagement Lead.
- Testing Assurance Lead and Manager.
- Spatial Architect (Project 8 - Landgate ICT).

The Program is not under-resourced at the centre. The gap is at the agency embedded layer, specifically in PTA for IP&A.

The technology partners

- **NGSC: Accenture** as primary, hosting on AWS, with ESRI parcel fabric, supported by 3DCE (3D cadastral SME advisor) and Surround Australia.
- **SDT: Jacobs** as primary, hosting on Azure, with Amristar (cloud platform/integration), Terria (visualisation/UX), and GC3 Digital (digital twin SME advice).
- **Key Jacobs SDT team identified:** Alistair Fox (Project Manager), Daniel Harvey (Solution Manager — Platform Enablement), Ana Belgun (Solution Manager — Visualisation/UX), Shrey Shroff (Solution Architect), Muy Ung (Integration Architect), Sonny Tham (Platform Architect), Amber Standley (UI/UX Lead). The Program SME counterpart is Evan Quick (Digital Twin SME) and Marco Van De Heide (Test Manager).

The post-MoG landscape, and what is still unclear

The MoG decision document itself is not in our document set. The new structure is inferable from current Working Group composition and the Advisory Onboard deck, but several mappings are unconfirmed.

What is now clear (from the new documents)

- **Department of Transport & Major Infrastructure (DTMI)** is the post-MoG portfolio-level entity. PTA is leading IP&A 'for DTMI' per the onboarding deck. The relationship between DTMI and its constituent agencies (PTA, Main Roads, the former DoT, OMTID, OMID) is portfolio-style rather than a single merged department; the constituent agencies remain identifiable in the WG lists.
- **Office of Major Infrastructure Delivery (OMID)** is a new entity that sits alongside OMTID. Both appear separately in the IP&A stakeholder list. OMID is likely broader (all major infrastructure) while OMTID remains focused on transport infrastructure.
- **DMIRS is now DMPE** (Department of Mining, Petroleum and Energy). Whether the DG (Richard Sellers, at the time of signing the AB4D Participation Agreement) carried into DMPE is unconfirmed from the documents.
- **The Working Group composition has 28 agencies represented** and 64 data custodians, with Level 1 'Guided Partnership' operational readiness support for the use case lead agencies and the DTMI portfolio agencies.

What is still unclear (and is in scope for the interview round)

- Who currently holds the role Peter Woronzow occupied as 'DG Transport Portfolio' at the time of the BC. The role may have been renamed, merged, or transferred during the MoG transition.

- Whether Russell Taylor is still PTA Chief Information Officer. If he has moved, the signed CIO-level commitment may need to be reaffirmed by the incumbent.
- The exact organisational relationship between DTMI and its constituent agencies. Specifically: does the Director General of DTMI have line authority over the PTA Director General, or are they peers within the portfolio?
- Whether OMTID's \$204.6m benefit attribution from the BC has been formally re-allocated to OMID, or whether it remains nominally with OMTID.
- The current Use Case Lead replacement plan at PTA. The role has been vacant since February 2026 (five months at engagement commencement).
- Water Corporation's intent on formalising its IP&A involvement. Their absence from the signed Participation Agreements is the most consequential gap in the commitment structure.

Remaining documentary gaps

The new input set fills most of the gaps v1 identified. What remains useful but absent:

- The Transport Portfolio MoG decision document (Cabinet/Premier's statement and current org charts).
 - Program Board papers since February 2026 (post-Use Case Lead departure).
 - The Spatial WA Risk Register (PDP Appendix N, referenced but not in our set).
 - The current Cost Model (PDP Appendix K, referenced but not in our set).
 - The successor digital strategy (Digital Strategy 2026-30 or equivalent), if one is in development.
-

§ 09

Timing and the 2028 deadline

The PDP commits to delivery of Horizon One implementation by June 2028. The signed Participation Agreements all reference this date. The technology contracts (Accenture for NGSC, Jacobs for SDT) commenced 27 October 2025 with implementation runs sized to complete by mid-2028.

Current milestones

NGSC delivery (Accenture), starting 27 October 2025:

- **Milestone 6: NGSC Release 1** (cadastral and administrative boundary management): mid-2026.
- **Milestone 7: NGSC Release 2** (admin boundary management for external agencies): late 2026 to early 2027.
- **Milestone 8: NGSC Release 3** (3D & 4D boundary management, integration with SDT): 2027.
- **Milestone 9: NGSC Readiness for service**: 2027.
- **Milestone 10: NGSC Release 4** (supported editing & full deployment): early 2028.

SDT delivery (Jacobs), starting 27 October 2025:

- **Milestone 3: Focus Area release** (Midland Station Precinct demonstration site for IP&A): late 2026.
- **Milestones 4-8: SDT Releases 1-5** across 2026-2028. Release 5 is SDT/NGSC integration.
- **Milestone 10: Full deployment and handover**: 2028.

What the 2028 deadline actually means

The deadline is for Horizon One implementation completion. Benefits realisation under the BMP runs to 2033. So '2028 benefits' realistically means 'benefits realisation underway by 2028, with the longer tail to 2033'. The question for each

of the BC's quantified benefits is: when does the underlying use case capability come live, and how much realisation time does it have between live-date and the political horizon date?

The Focus Area (Midland Station Precinct) is the first IP&A capability live, in late 2026. That gives IP&A approximately 18 months of implementation, 24 months of demonstrable realisation by Horizon One end (June 2028), and an additional 5 years to 2033 for the full realisation tail. By comparison, AB4D capability comes live in mid-2026 in NGSC Release 1, giving it more runway.

If the political horizon is moved earlier (e.g., the State Government wants benefits visible by election cycle rather than 2028), the use cases most exposed are IP&A (newest, broadest, most complex) and EMEM (newest theme overall). AB4D and DAW are more likely to show early measurable realisation.

§ 10

Working hypotheses for Nicole's interview round

These are the questions sharpened by the integrated documentation. The list is shorter than v1's because several of v1's questions are now answered.

For Landgate (Sponsor, Program Director)

- With the technology contracts now signed and implementation underway, what is the current confidence level on each of the four use cases delivering their consolidated benefits by June 2028?
- How is the Program Board responding to the IP&A Use Case Lead vacancy? Has the role been advertised? Who is providing operational continuity in the interim?

- Has the BMP recalibration of CBA benefits commenced? Is there a target date for the recalibrated benefits register?
- What is Landgate's read on Water Corporation's commitment to IP&A as a stakeholder, given their absence from the signed Participation Agreements?

For PTA (Sponsor-level)

- Is Russell Taylor still PTA CIO? If not, has the IP&A Participation Agreement been reaffirmed by the incumbent?
- How has the MoG transition affected PTA's operational capacity to lead IP&A 'for DTMI'? Is the leadership signal as strong now as when the agreement was signed in August 2023?
- What is the recruitment plan for the IP&A Use Case Lead role? What capabilities are being prioritised?
- Is Darren Mottolini (named in the BC's CBA contacts as PTA's Digital Transformation Programme Lead) still in role, and is the Digital Transformation programme still aligned with IP&A's needs?

For DTMI leadership (or its equivalent)

- How does DTMI as a portfolio relate operationally to PTA, Main Roads, OMTID, and OMID? Is portfolio-level coordination of IP&A in place?
- Where in the new structure does OMTID's \$204.6m utility-impact benefit (from the BC's CBA) sit? Is OMID picking up any portion of this?
- What is the post-MoG political cover for Spatial WA at portfolio level?

For OMTID and OMID

- How does OMTID see its role in IP&A now, given the use case is PTA-led? Is the working relationship operational?
- What is OMID's relationship to OMTID? Are they siblings within DTMI, or is OMID emerging as the broader infrastructure delivery vehicle that may eventually subsume OMTID?

For Water Corporation

- Why was Water Corp not a signatory to any of the five Participation Agreements?
- Is Water Corp open to formalising its IP&A involvement now? The initial focus on water utilities makes this material.

For DPLH

- With Action Plan for Planning Reform now formally aligned to DAW, how is DPLH measuring its contribution to the use case? Is the City of Swan 17x multiplier still believed?
- Has the DPLH-Landgate working relationship sustained since Anthony Kannis signed in August 2023?

For Infrastructure WA (post-Nicole leadership)

- How is the second State Infrastructure Strategy treating Spatial WA in its current cycle? Has Recommendation 4b been carried forward, retired, or re-scoped post the missed 2024 target?
- Is there a successor digital strategy in development that affects Spatial WA's positioning?

For DGov

- Is the Digital Capability Fund Steering Committee receiving reporting on Spatial WA at the cadence committed to?
- How is DGov's joint lead role with Landgate (per SIS Rec 4b) being operationalised?

§ 11

Nicole's positioning in the work

With the integrated documentation visible, Nicole's positioning is sharper than v1 indicated:

8. **The conflict of interest declaration needs to be extended.** The proposal currently discloses Nicole's Infrastructure WA chair tenure (2019-March 2026). The Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 explicitly lists Westport as an IP&A stakeholder. Nicole is Chair of Westport. This should be added to the disclosed COI alongside the IWA history, with the same management protocols applied. The strength of the disclosure (transparent, with controls) becomes greater, not lesser, by including this.
9. **Nicole has direct primary-source access to multiple of the documents the BMP recalibration will rest on.** The 2017 WALIA Review (her authorship) is named in the Business Case as the conceptual origin of Spatial WA. The first and second State Infrastructure Strategies (her IWA chair tenure) are the source of Recommendation 4b. The WA Market Capacity Tool (an IWA product under her oversight) is a direct parallel to Spatial WA's whole-of-government decision-making capability. She is not advising on a program with which she has limited prior involvement; she is advising on a program whose strategic genealogy traces directly to her work.
10. **The Strategic Review Report should be honest about the headline economics.** The 14.4 BCR is in the foreword of the BC and on every government summary. The 3.8 use-case BCR is what the BMP will recalibrate against. The PDP did not refresh these numbers; they were carried forward unchanged. Nicole's report can hold both, but should quietly anchor the recommendations in the 3.8, and can recommend that the BMP recalibration be brought forward as a Board priority. That distinction is exactly the kind of correction a former IWA Chair is positioned to make.
11. **The IP&A use case has structural soundness underneath the operational soft spot.** The signed Participation Agreement is real, the technology contracts are signed, the demonstration site is chosen, the release schedule runs. The vacant Use Case Lead role is the rate-limiting issue, not a structural one. Nicole's Stage 2 advisory work is ideally shaped to be the bridge while the role is being re-staffed.

§ 12

Headline framing for the Strategic Review Report

Refined from v1, with the integrated evidence:

The Spatial WA Program is structurally sound and operationally underway. Technology contracts with Accenture (NGSC) and Jacobs (SDT) commenced 27 October 2025, with staged releases running through to mid-2028. Five Participation Agreements are signed by partner agencies; the Program Board has seven named agency sponsors; the Use Case Scope Definition V1.4 (October 2025) is the live operational spec. The Business Case's \$1.5bn headline economic case was carried forward into the PDP unchanged, but the Benefits Management Plan commits to recalibration that has not yet occurred; the use-case BCR of 3.8 is the more defensible benefits-realisation anchor. The single greatest vulnerability is concentrated, identifiable, and recoverable: the IP&A Use Case Lead role (PSCA Level 8, funded by Landgate and embedded in PTA) has been vacant since February 2026, in the same window as the Transport Portfolio MoG settled. The use case the RFQ is named on carries approximately 64% of the Program's quantified benefits. Restoring the role with an incumbent who has both technical capability and credible standing across the post-MoG DTMI ecosystem is the most consequential single intervention available to the Program Board between now and the June 2028 Horizon One completion date. Nicole's executive advisory engagement is uniquely positioned to bridge that gap during the re-staffing window, and to widen the Board's view of the

use case beyond PTA-as-sole-lead into the DTMI portfolio it now sits within.

That paragraph is testable against the interviews and revisable as the picture sharpens. It is the seed of the Executive Summary.

§ 13

Potentials log

Threads worth tracking but not for this phase:

- **BMP recalibration as a Board priority.** The PDP committed to recalibration. The fact that it has not happened is in itself a useful finding. The Strategic Review Report could recommend it be brought forward, with the WATC engagement potentially refreshed.
- **DTMI portfolio-level sponsorship for IP&A.** PTA is leading 'for DTMI' but the political cover at portfolio level is not formalised. A DTMI DG-level Participation Agreement (or an addendum to the existing PTA agreement) would harden the sponsorship structure. Stage 2 work.
- **Water Corporation's IP&A status.** Either formalise via a new Participation Agreement or explicitly de-scope the BC's Buried Services benefit from the IP&A line. The current ambiguity is the worst of both worlds.
- **The Industry Reference Group** (planned for May-June 2026 in the engagement calendar). Surveyors, planners, land and property developers, engineers, construction. Nicole's Westport, IWA, and Lockwood Advisory networks intersect with this group. Stage 2 stakeholder engagement design opportunity.
- **The Digital Strategy 2026 successor.** If a successor strategy is in development with DGov, Spatial WA's positioning in it is worth shaping. Stage 2 conversation with DGov.

- **OMID's emergence as a vehicle for the BC's \$204m utility-impact benefit.**
OMID is broader than OMTID. If OMID is the post-MoG home for major infrastructure delivery, the \$204.6m line may need to be re-attributed during the BMP recalibration.

End of working analysis version 2. The Strategic Review Report due 30 June 2026 will be built from this analysis plus the stakeholder consultations now underway plus any further inputs that arrive (Risk Register, current Cost Model, Transport Portfolio MoG decision documentation).